

**VINEYARD TOWN  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
Vineyard Town Hall, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah  
Wednesday, November 30, 2011, 7:00 pm**

**Commissioners Present:**

Commission Chair Tyler Bergen  
Commissioner Wayne Holdaway  
Commissioner Dave Robins  
Commissioner Kelly Wixom

**Commissioners Absent:**

Commissioner Steve Carlile

**Staff Present:**

Cathy Larsen, Associate Deputy Recorder  
Jim Carter, Town Planner  
Don Overson, Town Engineer  
Sullivan Love, Town Water Official

**Others Present:**

Duane Rasmussen, Castlewood Development  
Jerry Grover, Anderson Geneva Development  
Ed Gramp, Anderson Geneva Development

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

This meeting of the Vineyard Town Planning Commission, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Commission Chair Tyler Bergen.

**2. PRAYER**

Invocation was offered by Tyler Bergen.

**3. OPEN SESSION**

No Public Comment.

**4. COUNCIL UPDATE**

No Council update.

**5. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

No minutes for review and approval.

**6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**6.1 Discussion/Action Geneva Gateway Subdivision (FP-10-03)**

*TABLED* – This item was tabled until further in the meeting.

**6.2 Discussion/Action of Castlewood Development Geneva Gateway Residential Development Plan (PU-11-01)**

- Jim Carter – The subject property is zoned Regional Mixed Use (RMU) and is designated RMU on the General Plan land use map. The original subdivision application

was filed in July 2010. There was not a development plan for the residential parcel; there was not a concept for the commercial. The subdivision application went on hold. There is now a developer for the residential parcel, which is Castlewood Development. Jim recommends looking at the development plan for the Castlewood Development parcel first before addressing the subdivision submittal. Then make a recommendation to Town Council for the development plan. Subject to the development plan being approved, Castlewood Development would put together a final, it would be reviewed by staff, go through final approval, and building permits would be issued. Planning Commission, today, is reviewing this Concept Plan.

- Duane Rasmussen – He agrees with everything in Jim's staff report. Castlewood Development meets or exceeds the standards that have been set in the RMU Zone in respect to open space, the patios associated with the units, and common area amenities. Building heights are well within the specifications in the RMU Zone. The setbacks and landscaping plans are set out. The garages serve as a much higher sound neutralization than a typical fence would. There are small breaks in between them, which would be brought up to the backs of the garages with the level of the fence. All fences are shielded with garages. The garages architecturally match the building.
- Jim Carter – The yields and number of units comes in under the maximum density for the RMU Zone. The maximum residential density in the RMU zone is 20 units per acre, and this project is 18.4 units per acre. The structures are all within the 48-foot height maximum. There was some back-and-forth on getting the calculations on the open space amenities, but it has been changed. This site plan leaves places for Central Utah Water Conservative District to construct water wells. Central Utah Water has an agreement with the Town. Central Utah Water preliminarily identified well locations along the railroad tracks. Central Utah Water pinned down the well locations and gave them dimensions.
- Duane Rasmussen – Central Utah Water is still working out the specific location of the wells, but the sites are identified by the open spaces.
- Jerry Grover – Central Utah Water owns the parcels where the wells exist now. The agreement with Central Utah Water and Anderson Development is that the wells can be moved within 600 feet of their current location as long as it is six (6) months prior to drilling. That is for all the well sites on Geneva property.
- Dave Robins – Are the well spaces part of the open spaces? Will there be access to service these? Are these wells going to be lighted or fenced in?
- Don Overson – These are several concerns that Central Utah Water talked about in their meeting. Central Utah Water is required by law to have secured facilities, which means they will be fenced and lighted at all times. There are three main items of concern: 1.) There is concern about having buildings too close to the well house where there will be light in the windows at all times. 2.) There is concern that the noise from the pumps will be an issue. There will be large pumps that will be pushing water out to Saratoga Springs, which are fairly noisy. 3.) There is also concern about access points. The plat did not show access points into the Central Utah Water property. There is concern about the location of the pipe and whether there will be access to it in the event of repair. The cross-section shows the spacing from the garage is correct, but utilities are being put in fairly close to the water line.
- Jim Carter – Central Utah Water got Conditional Use approval to install the wells. One of the conditions of approval was each of the well sites is subject to review and conditions attached to the approval to not prevent the beneficial use of the property surrounding the well. In conversation with Central Utah Water, it was conveyed that this well will be surrounded by high dollar real estate. This is not going to be an industrial building with metal sound insulation and mercury lights.

- Jerry Grover – There are a set of CC & Rs (Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions) that apply to many wells on the Anderson Geneva Property. There are architectural controls that Central Utah Water has to comply to.
- Jim Carter – Access will need to be provided for the wells.
- Jerry Grover – There is currently a recorded easement in place for the wells.
- Don Overson – There is nothing here that can't be addressed or dealt with. One of his biggest concern is access to the property. There needs to be so many parking stalls, but right now the parking stalls go right across both access points.
- Duane Rasmussen – Castlewood Development is over-parked in terms of Town standards. The stalls are eleven (11) feet wide, and two of them could be given up to provide twenty-two (22) feet of access. Castlewood Development's engineers have been in contact with Anderson Development, as well as the engineers for Central Utah Water. The CC & Rs are being currently being reviewed. He agrees that there is nothing that can't be worked out.
- Don Overson – One of his biggest concerns is to make sure there is a good working relationship with Central Utah Water. This will be a long-term working relationship, and he doesn't want any bridges burned on the first try. Also, the residents of the multi-complex will become new citizens of Vineyard Town. He doesn't want the Town set up to receive a lot of complaints.
- Dave Robins – Are the well sites part of the open space calculation?
- Jim Carter – The well site is part of the open space. The open space is high enough that even without the well sites, the open space minimum will still be met.
- Duane Rasmussen – Castlewood Development needs to go back and calculate the open space without the well sites. Even without the well sites, there should be adequate coverage of open space. The wells shouldn't have been included in the open space as part of a fair standard space.
- Jim Carter – The open space would drop from 5.56 acres of open space to about 5 acres of open space. This would drop the percentage of open space to 30%, which would include landscaped open space and the recreational facility. The minimum open space requirement is 10% in the zone.
- Dave Robins – Is definition of open space landscaped or usable open space? He doesn't see a lot of usable open space.
- Duane Rasmussen – Castlewood Development will go back and map out what that open space will actually be.
- Jim Carter – The key component at this stage is the intensity of the use and the general layout of the site. The Site Plan demonstrates that there can be a yield of 18-20 units per acre and still maintain considerable open space.
- Duane Rasmussen – There are two larger open-space lots (the pool and the clubhouse), as well as the trails and the extra berming and landscaping around it.
- Dave Robins – Is this going to be more of student housing? There is a concern with this being so close to Utah Valley University (UVU) that instead of a family with 1-2 cars, you will have six (6) students with 5-6 cars. That is definitely an issue.
- Duane Rasmussen – The parking will be over two (2) stalls per unit. Castlewood Development always figures in at least 1.8 parking stalls per acre, and tries to meet a ratio of two (2) parking stalls per acre. There are strict standards as to how many individuals can occupy a lease. These are more family-oriented units, with one, two, and three bedroom units. These are not built so you can stack 2-3 individuals per bedroom, and they police the parking stringently during the leases.
- Dave Robins – Realistically, because of the location, there will be students living there.

- Duane Rasmussen – There may be students, but they won't be crammed in like the student apartments.
- Dave Robins – He is concerned where this unit is being proposed because of the wells, next to a railroad track, and close to a five-lane highway. It doesn't seem like an attractive family unit location. He is also concerned there will be complaints from residents about the noise.
- Jim Carter – It is close to the park and within walking distance from the school. If it weren't for the railroad tracks, it would be an ideal location for multi-family units because of access to all the amenities. It is an odd parcel. The concept of the whole RMU Zone is that it would be a mixture of high density residential and commercial use. This parcel is not designed for single family residential use. The entire parcel could go commercial, but the Town is trying to offer a mixture of both residential and commercial in the zone. All multi-family residential has a potential for parking issues, and you have to think of creative ways to handle it.
- Duane Rasmussen – The five-lane highway is actually a plus. It gives people easy access, as does Geneva Road. The railroad is a minus but can be overcome with garages and fencing to provide sound neutralization. They just had an opening of a multi-level complex in South Jordan that has a railroad track that carries 10-12 trains a day and is approximately the same distance away from the unit. It hasn't been a problem, and the unit is 95% leased. That project was approved by HUD, and they have very strict standards.
- Wayne Holdaway – This is such an unusual parcel. What could Anderson Development use this for?
- Tyler Bergen – Will there be both access points into the subdivision?
- Jerry Grover – UDOT is constructing both an access off of Geneva Road and one off of Center Street as part of their design.
- Jim Carter – One of the conditions that will be required is documentation of UDOT's acceptance or approval of the accesses.
- Jerry Grover – He provided the contract of sale, and the contract talks about UDOT agreeing to approve Center Street as a public road at the time the future roadway is completed.
- Jim Carter – Development of the Castlewood Project would not commence until utilities are constructed, both accesses are completed, and Center Street is constructed to where the access point is.
- Dave Robins – For years, it has been the plan to have access from Center (east to west).
- Jerry Grover – The Roadway Plan was changed eight (8) months ago. This Center Street construction would go to a point where the future overpass will be.
- Don Overson – With Geneva Road coming in and taking more road area, the lagging point and connection couldn't be met and still meet UDOT's standards. The configuration for Center Street has changed from straight through to turning. Most of the traffic will be driven to the commercial area, and only the people who want to get across the railroad tracks will need to cross.
- Dave Robins – He currently has some dealings with Anderson Development that are still being resolved. Since Anderson Development is the owner of this property, this would create a conflict of interest. He would need to abstain from voting.

**TABLED** - This item was tabled for further discussion until the arrival of Commissioner Wixom.

## **6.1 Discussion/Action: Geneva Gateway Subdivision (FP-10-03)**

- Jim Carter – This was originally proposed as a current review as a preliminary and final plat. As it got farther into, a lot of details needs to be put in before can go forward. What remains to be pinned down is the drainage. Are there still things that need to be put in.
- Jerry Grover – There were some changes since the last Planning Commission. The final is the same layout as the preliminary. There are not a lot of options where the parcel is located. A lot of the configuration is designated by the nature of where it is located. The culinary water is coming across Center Street. There is a master meter where Orem Water is coming in. There is the drainage issue; don't have the final elevations. Ditch will be replaced with culvert. The drainage flows north along the railroad tracks. Kiewit has installed a culvert under Geneva Road. The sewer will come across at the overpass area and under the railroad tracks with a bore. All of the utilities line up fine with the Road Plan.
- Don Overson – The water line has also got to come through.
- Jerry Grover – All utilities line up fine with the Road Plan.
- Jim Carter – Two 10,000 square foot well site parcels are currently in the ownership of Central Utah Water.
- Jerry Grover – When Central Utah Water bought the water project they bought the existing wells. All the existing wells were located by 8<sup>th</sup> North. They couldn't use those wells for the draw of water they needed. They came to Anderson Development and said that fifteen (15) well sites were needed, and it was preferred that the well sites were in some linear alignment. There had to be a certain amount of spacing. The railroad track seemed to be a perfect fit for that. The contract says that there had to be some flexibility with the development plan to be able to move the easements around. There is a blanket easement for access. They don't have an issue with specific locations. How do they accommodate the easement of the pipe plan?

**Commissioner Wixom arrived at 7:50 p.m.**

- Don Overson – You need to look at the plat to see if anything would change if Castlewood Development were taken out of the scenario. That is a six-lot subdivision created from a triangular parcel. The Town needs to make sure the lots are subdivided according to Town standards. There needs to be utilities in place and access to make sure each lot can be served. He only sees a fewer miner things.
- Dave Robins – Will lots 1, 2, and 3 be accessed off of Geneva Road?
- Jerry Grover – There is an access off of Geneva Road; one access into all three lots.
- Don Overson – He would require a new cross access between the properties, and would be required as part of the Site Plan approval.

**MOTION – TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ACCEPT THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL GENEVA GATEWAY SUBDIVISION PLATS SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE PLANNING STAFF: 1.) THE FINAL PLAT SHALL NOT BE RECORDED UNTIL THE FINAL ENGINEERING FOR THE PLAT IS APPROVED BY THE TOWN ENGINEER; 2.) THE FINAL PLAT SHALL NOT BE RECORDED UNTIL UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) DOCUMENTS ITS APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ACCESSES ONTO GENEVA ROAD; 3.) THE FINAL PLAT SHALL NOT BE**

**RECORDED UNTIL THE OWNERSHIP STATUS OF THE TWO WATER WELL SITES IS DETERMINED AND THE PLAT IS EITHER AMENDED OR CONFIRMED ACCORDINGLY; AND 4.) NO BUILDING PERMITS SHALL BE ISSUED FOR LOTS 4, 5, OR 6 UNTIL CENTER STREET AND INCLUDED UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS ARE CONTRUCTED. 5.) WOULD REQUIRE A NEW CROSS ACCESS BETWEEN THE PROPERTIES, AS PART OF THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL.** Motion by Commissioner Holdaway, and seconded by Commissioner Wixom. Dave Robins abstains from voting. Tyler Bergen, Wayne Holdaway, and Kelly Wixom are in favor. The Motion carries.

**6.2 Discussion/Action: Castlewood Development Geneva Gateway Residential Development Plan (PU-11-01)**

**Further Discussion:**

- Sullivan Love – If this gets developed and built before the wells are put in, the access to the well sites will be severely limited. It has a huge effect if the wells are built at a later date.
- Jim Carter – The last conversation with Central Utah Water relayed that they wanted to start at the north and work their way south. They may find they are working in areas that are already developed. The Town may want to get the wells drilled and encased as part of the stipulation. That way all Central Utah Water has to do is come in and construct the well houses. This could be part of the discussion with Central Utah Water.
- Don Overson – The next place that Central Utah Water is going to drill is at the 8<sup>th</sup> North well sites. They are connecting to the water line right now. It may be the Town and elected officials that should come up with a strategy for Central Utah Water. There may be negotiation rights.
- Jerry Grover – He understands that Central Utah Water prefers to drill the wells in advance.
- Duane Rasmussen – Castlewood Development and Anderson Geneva can set up a meeting with Central Utah Water to rethink the process. Castlewood Development would like to start construction in the latter part of 2012 or early part of 2013. The project will take a process to get through the financial approvals. They want to see Geneva Road done, Center Street done, and the utilities in. They need to get HUD approvals.

**MOTION – TO MOVE THAT PLANNING COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE TOWN COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE CASTLEWOOD DEVELOPMENT GENEVA GATEWAY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1.) THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVED BY TOWN COUNCIL, AND SHALL CONFORM TO THE FINAL ENGINEERING FOR THE GENEVA GATEWAY SUBDIVISION PLAT, AS APPROVED BY THE TOWN ENGINEER, AND 2.) NO BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE ISSUED FOR THE CASTLEWOOD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT UNTIL CENTER STREET AND INCLUDED UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS ARE CONSTRUCTED, AND LEGAL ACCESS TO BOTH GENEVA ROAD AND CENTER STREET ARE DOCUMENTED.** Motion by Commissioner Bergen, and seconded by Commissioner Wixom. Dave Robins abstains from voting. Tyler Bergen, Wayne Holdaway, and Kelly Wixom are in favor. The Motion carries.

### **6.3 Discussion and Action: 2011 ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE**

**MOTION – TO APPROVE MEETING SCHEDULE AS OUTLINED IN THE AGENDA.** Motion by Commissioner Wixom, and seconded by Commissioner Holdaway. All are in favor. The Motion carries.

### **7. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER'S REPORTS**

- Commissioner Robins is concerned about racers along Gammon Road.

### **8. STAFF REPORTS**

- Don Overson – The traffic will be moved to the west side of Geneva Road. Construction will take place through the winter. The project has to be completed by May 31, 2012. Eventually there will be an intersection and cul-de-sac into the parcel. A truck from the Freeway Project was followed and seen dumping into The Lakes at Sleepy Ridge subdivision.

### **9. ITEMS REQUESTED FOR NEXT AGENDA**

None.

### **10. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION – TO ADJOURN THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.** Motion by Commissioner Holdaway, and seconded by Commissioner Wixom. All are in favor. The Motion carries. Meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION ON: June 6, 2012

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy D. Larsen, Associate Deputy Recorder